

it's very important to understand that the question of water rights for Rocky Mountain National Park wilderness is entirely different from many considered before, and is far simpler.

To begin with, it has long been recognized under the laws of the United States and Colorado, including a decision of the Colorado Supreme Court, that Rocky Mountain National Park already has extensive federal reserved water rights arising from the creation of the national park itself.

This is not, so far as I have been able to find out, a controversial decision, because there is a widespread consensus that there should be no new water projects developed within Rocky Mountain National Park. And, since the park sits astride the continental divide, there's no higher land around from which streams flow into the park, so there is no possibility of any upstream diversions. And it's important to emphasize that in any event water rights associated with wilderness would amount only to guarantees that water will continue to flow through and out of the park as it always has. This preserves the natural environment of the park, but it doesn't affect downstream water use.

The bottom line is that once water leaves the park, it will continue to be available for diversion and use under Colorado law regardless of whether or not lands within the park are designated as wilderness.

These legal and practical realities are reflected in my bill—as in my predecessor's—by inclusion of a finding that because the park already has these extensive reserved rights to water, there is no need for any additional reservation of such right, and an explicit disclaimer that the bill effects any such reservation.

Some may ask, why should we designate wilderness in a national park? Isn't park protection the same as wilderness, or at least as good? The answer is that the wilderness designation will give an important additional level of protection to most of the park.

Our national park system was created, in part, to recognize and preserve prime examples of outstanding landscape. At Rocky Mountain National Park in particular, good Park Service management over the past 83 years has kept most of the park in a natural condition. And all the lands that are covered by this bill are currently being managed, in essence, to protect their wilderness character. Formal wilderness designation will no longer leave this question to the discretion of the Park Service, but will make it clear that within the designated areas there will never be roads, visitor facilities, or other manmade features that interfere with the spectacular natural beauty and wildness of the mountains.

This kind of protection is especially important for a park like Rocky Mountain, which is relatively small by western standards. As nearby land development and alteration has accelerated in recent years, the pristine nature of the park's backcountry becomes an increasingly rare feature of Colorado's landscape.

Further, Rocky Mountain National Park's popularity demands definitive and permanent protection for wild areas against possible pressures for development within the park. While only about one tenth the size of Yellowstone National Park, Rocky Mountain sees nearly the same number of visitors each year as does our first national park.

At the same time, designating these carefully selected portions of Rocky Mountain as

wilderness will make other areas, now restricted under interim wilderness protection management, available for overdue improvements to park roads and visitor facilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill will protect some of our nation's finest wild lands. It will protect existing rights. It will not limit any existing opportunity for new water development. And it will affirm our commitment in Colorado to preserving the very features that make our State such a remarkable place to live. So, I think the bill deserves prompt enactment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

February 28, 2006: Rollcall vote 14, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1096, to establish the Thomas Edison National Historical Park, I would have voted "aye." Rollcall vote 15, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 668—celebrating the 40th anniversary of Texas Western's 1966 NCAA Basketball Championship, I would have voted "aye." Rollcall vote 16, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1259—to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress, I would have voted "aye."

March 1, 2006: Rollcall vote 17, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 357—honoring Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, I would have voted "aye."

March 2, 2006: Rollcall vote 18, on ordering the previous question, H. Res. 702—providing for consideration of H.R. 4167, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, I would have voted "aye."

TRIBUTE TO FAMILY-LIFE TV

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the 30th Anniversary of Family-Life TV. Throughout its existence, Family-Life TV has offered quality religious, entertainment, and informational programming and it is my hope that it will continue to provide these services long into the future.

Founded on March 7, 1976, Family-Life TV was the brainchild of David J. Croyle. Too young to legally run the station himself, David's father, Reverend Robert F. Croyle, served as the station's first President. This role passed to David upon his father's death in 2001.

The station initially broadcasted three hours each day and only reached cable subscribers in central Armstrong County. Since that time, Family-Life TV has grown rapidly. It now offers 24 hour programming and reaches cable subscribers well beyond its initial range. Additionally, Family-Life TV has ventured into the realm of the internet, touching the lives of indi-

viduals from over 30 different nations worldwide.

Family-Life TV has become the thread that binds the Armstrong community together and ties it to the world. For this, its record of impeccable quality programming, and its 30 years of broadcasting, Family-Life TV deserves thanks and congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my fellow members will join me at this time, and once again congratulate Family-Life TV on its 30th Anniversary and wish it a long and successful future.

OPPOSITION TO LIMITATIONS ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN ROMANIA

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to any limitations on religious freedom in Romania.

The religion bill that recently passed the Romanian Senate, discriminates against virtually all Christians except the dominant Orthodox Church. The bill that now stands before the Chamber of Deputies would in many ways treat Evangelical Protestants and Catholics as inferior.

The Romanian bill would restrict minority religious education and the use of church cemeteries, and would not protect private legal rights for all religious denominations or allow tax incentives to donors.

The spokesperson for a leading human rights group in Bucharest said "the draft law infringes many laws and the Constitution of Romania, as well as international human rights commitments to which Romania is subject" and that "it would close the possibility for religious communities, such as the Greek Catholic churches, to reclaim any property in the hands of other faiths." The head of the Romanian Evangelical Alliance, Dr. Paul Negrut, pronounced NAY GROOTS, with whom I met two weeks ago said: "this is a very critical time for religious liberty in Romania."

Because we as Americans have to stand for religious freedom everywhere, we are especially concerned about this development in an emerging democracy that is a friend and ally of the U.S.

As one who has championed the Houses of Worship bill in the U.S. Congress, it is a personal matter of importance to me.

I urge the Romanian President and the Romanian Parliament to reject this discriminatory religious bill to help protect freedom of religion and to help improve U.S.-Romanian relations.

CALLING FOR THE IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE "FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 2005"

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call for the immediate passage of H. Res. 614, a bill which allows for the consideration of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 2005, to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 2005 will provide a desperately needed raise in the minimum wage from \$5.15 per hour to \$7.25 per hour.

The members of the Congress that have denied a minimum wage increase while voting themselves seven pay increases worth \$28,000 should be ashamed of themselves.

On Tuesday, January 17th, 2006, Maryland became the 18th state in the Nation to enact a law that will make Maryland's minimum wage higher than the federal. Even in my home state of California, the minimum wage is \$6.75 an hour. The current minimum has not been raised in over 7 years!

The minimum wage was established to assure that people who work are not forced to live in poverty. Wage inequality keeps increasing in the United States, in part because of the declining real value of the minimum wage, yet this Congress refused to adjust the minimum wage even for inflation. If the minimum wage had kept pace with inflation since 1968 (when it was \$1.60 an hour) it would have been \$9.14 an hour in 2005.

Nearly 36 million people live below the poverty-line today—4.3 million more than when President Bush took office—and that number includes 13 million children. Among full-time, year-round workers, poverty has doubled since the late 1970s—from roughly 1.3 million then to more than 2.6 million today. And a report from the Children's Defense Fund shows that a single parent working full-time at the current minimum wage earns enough to cover only 40 percent of the cost of raising two children.

Today, the minimum wage is 33 percent of the average hourly wage of American workers, the lowest level since 1949.

Contrary to misinformation spread by opponents of the minimum wage, adults make up the largest share of workers who would benefit from a minimum wage increase. Forty percent of minimum wage workers are the sole breadwinners in their families. Moreover, despite what many opponents of the minimum wage say, there is no evidence of job loss from the last minimum wage increase.

A hike in the federal minimum wage is long overdue! We must restore the value of the federal wage floor in order to lift families out of poverty. An increase in the minimum wage is both humane and good for the economy because it would raise the standard of living of millions of Americans, while providing the economy with a needed boost by increasing the purchasing power of working families.

Seven and a half million workers and their families would directly benefit from the proposed minimum wage increase. An additional eight million workers would benefit indirectly, via resulting raises. Women and minorities would especially benefit. 61 percent of minimum wage earners are women and almost one-third of those women are raising children; And 35 percent of them are their families' sole earners! 19 percent of minimum wage earners are Hispanic American; and 15 percent are African American.

Women and minorities are disproportionately affected by the refusal of this Congress to pass a higher minimum wage. This issue shouldn't be a political debate. It should simply be about helping America's families. And that help won't come until workers in those low-wage occupations are paid more than poverty-level wages. I have always and will continue

to fight for a minimum wage that provides a future for America's families.

NATIONAL UNIFORMITY FOR FOOD ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J.H. "JOE" SCHWARZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes:

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the National Uniformity for Food Act deserves our full support. The issue is important to consumers and has achieved bipartisan support.

This act is consistent with our long tradition of prudent Congressional oversight of interstate commerce to protect American consumers. The act is simple. Its purpose is to provide equitable protection of consumers by requiring the States and the FDA to provide consumers with a single standard for food safety that is based on a consensus interpretation of all available science.

I believe the National Uniformity for Food Act is the best way to ensure that the safeguards we now have over meat, poultry, drugs, and many other products be applied to packaged food. Under the bill, States would retain their important functions such as sanitation, inspections and enforcement. The act contains mechanisms to review State food safety laws and consider them for national application.

This act provides important Federal protections, while retaining valuable input from States and coordination between State and Federal food safety experts. There is no better way to assure Americans that packaged food they find on our store shelves is safe for them and their families. I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this important act.

COMMEMORATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF LA CROSSE, WISCONSIN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of my hometown of La Crosse, Wisconsin. I cannot think of a better place to grow up, live, and raise a family. From the rolling bluffs to the lakes and rivers and the miles of hiking and biking trails, La Crosse truly is God's country. Its warm, generous, and adventurous citizens are examples of the best our country has to offer.

This beautiful river town was founded at the confluence of the Mississippi, the La Crosse, and the Black Rivers, an area first used by Native Americans as a passageway through the prairie lands of the Upper Midwest. The Native Americans were followed by French fur

traders, who established commerce with the Indians living along the river's edge. The traders named La Crosse after the Native American game played with netted sticks used to catch a ball. From the Native Americans and French fur traders to the vast grain barges of today, the movement of goods along the water keeps La Crosse thriving.

La Crosse was founded in 1841, by a pioneer from New York named Nathan Myrick. Myrick established a trading post on Barron Island where he first traded with the Ho-Chunk Indians. Once Myrick extended his business to trading with steamboat passengers, settlers began targeting La Crosse for its rich farming potential. Soon thereafter, the lumber industry blossomed. Using the river as their natural transportation, lumberjacks floated logs downriver to be processed. By 1858, the railroad was built, bringing with it additional growth and development.

Having been born and raised in the city and traveled to other places around the world, I truly appreciate the solid Midwestern values and spirit of the people in La Crosse—values that emphasize kindness, honesty, family, and community combined with the can-do attitude of the town's founders.

Home to ten grade schools, two high schools, two universities, and one technical school, La Crosse highly values quality education for its youth. The city has adjusted to the changing times to remain an important center of transportation, commerce, and industry in western Wisconsin. La Crosse has succeeded in establishing a family- and business-friendly environment and will continue to thrive well beyond its next 150 years.

La Crosse's sesquicentennial provides an opportunity to commemorate the town's history, ancestors, and traditions. With its historic homes, commercial district, natural areas, museums, restaurants, and specialty shops, La Crosse provides residents and visitors with much to choose from. I enthusiastically invite all my colleagues, their families and friends to visit the Coulee Region and the city of La Crosse.

The people of La Crosse are committed to growth in their community while maintaining the harmony of the surrounding land, and I am proud to call this beautiful and friendly city my home.

CONGRATULATING PETER J. FORBES AS HE IS HONORED BY THE QUIET MAN SOCIETY OF SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2006

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask you and my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to Mr. Peter J. Forbes, of northeastern Pennsylvania, this year's recipient of The Quiet Man Society's "Michael F. King, Jr. Armed Forces Veterans Award."

The award is presented annually to a local individual who, after serving in the Armed Forces, by their actions and involvement in community events, exhibited exemplary continued service to God, family and country.

The award was endowed by The Quiet Man Society in honor of Mr. King, a charter member of the Society, who was wounded twice in